

Ray L. Wong (SBN 84193)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
Spear Tower
One Market Plaza, Suite 2200
San Francisco, CA 94105-1127
Telephone: +1 415 957 3000
Fax: +1 415 957 3001
E-mail: rkwong@duanemorris.com

Patrick S. Salceda (SBN 247978)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
2475 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194
Telephone: +1 650 847 4150
Fax: +1 650 847 4151
E-mail: psalceda@duanemorris.com

Attorneys for Defendant
GENEA ENERGY PARTNERS, INC.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**JOHN MATTER, dba MATTER SYSTEMS
and MARK FULTON, dba INTEGRITY
AUTO-MATED SOLUTIONS,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

KEITH VOYSEY, Chief Technology Officer, GENEVA ENERGY PARTNERS, INC., a California Corporation, DAVID BALKIN, position unknown, CHRIS TAYLOR, position unknown, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:15-cv-00978-CJC-AGR

**CONSOLIDATED REQUEST
FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN
SUPPORT OF GENEVA ENERGY
PARTNERS, INC.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS AND MOTION FOR
SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO
RULE 11**

Date: January 11, 2016
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept: 9B

Judge: Hon. Cormac J. Carney
Complaint Filed: June 19, 2015
FAC Filed: October 5, 2015

Defendant, GENEVA ENERGY PARTNERS, INC. (“Genea”), in support of its
(1) Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Federal Subject Matter Jurisdiction and for Failure
to State Claim Upon Which Relief Can Be Granted (“Motion to Dismiss”), and (2)

1 Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 11 (“Motion for Sanctions”) respectfully
2 request that the Court take judicial notice pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201 of
3 the following court documents:

4 1. Complaint for Declaratory Relief (Patent Infringement) against Genea
5 (Dkt. 1), filed September 10, 2012 in the Central District of California, Case No. 8-12-
6 cv-01506 (“First Federal Action”).¹

7 2. June 22, 2011 Cease and Desist Letter sent by John Giust to Mark Fulton
8 and John Matter. This letter was previously attached as Exhibit B to Complaint for
9 Declaratory Relief in the First Federal Action.

10 3. Genea Energy’s Supplemental Statement Re: Discovery Dispute
11 Concerning Genea’s Request for Inspection Directed to Plaintiffs (Dkt. 27), filed
12 August 26, 2013 in the First Federal Action.

13 4. Declaration of John Giust in Support of Genea’s Supplemental Statement
14 re: Discovery Dispute Concerning Genea’s Request for Inspection Directed to
15 Plaintiffs (Dkt. 27-2), filed August 26, 2013 in the First Federal Action.

16 5. Civil minutes order issued by Judge David O. Carter’s ordering
17 inspection of the WEBSmartAir Product (Dkt. 39), filed October 17, 2013 in the First
18 Federal Action.

19 6. Plaintiffs’ Answer with Counterclaims to Genea’ First Amended Answer
20 (Dkt. 37), filed October 18, 2013 in the First Federal Action.

21 7. Memorandum of Point and Authorities in Support of Genea’s Motion to
22 Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction (Dkt. 41-1), filed November 4, 2013 in the First
23 Federal Action.

24
25 ¹ The materials referenced in paragraphs 1 through 12 are court records from Plaintiffs’ first federal
26 lawsuit against Genea entitled *Mark Fulton et al v. Genea Energy Partners*, C.A. No. 8-12-cv-01506
27 (C.D. Cal.), and are available through the Court’s ECF website. Defendants have not attached
28 separate copies of these referenced materials, which together total more than 100 pages, so as to
avoid overburdening the Court with a voluminous submission. Nonetheless, should the Court prefer
copies of these items, Genea will provide them immediately upon the Court’s request.

1 8. Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint
2 (Dkt. 56), filed December 1, 2013 in the First Federal Action.

3 9. Plaintiffs' Withdrawal of Plaintiffs' [PROPOSED] First Amended
4 Complaint for Damages (Dkt. 58), filed December 10, 2013 in the First Federal
5 Action.

6 10. Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion and Renewed Motion for Leave to File First
7 Amended Complaint (Dkt. 83), filed January 24, 2014 in the First Federal Action.

8 11. Civil Minutes Order issued by Judge David O. Carter's Order granting
9 Genea's Motion to Dismiss the First Federal Complaint (Dkt. 93), entered February
10 25, 2014 in the First Federal Action.

11 12. Judge David O. Carter's Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration
12 (Dkt. 103), filed June 10, 2014 in the First Federal Action.

13 13. Plaintiffs' Complaint for Damages, filed July 23, 2014 in the Superior
14 Court for the State of California, County of Orange, Case No. 30-2014-00735850
15 ("State Action"). A true and correct copy of this court record is attached hereto as
16 Exhibit 1.

17 14. Genea's Notice and Statement of Demurrer to the State Complaint, filed
18 October 17, 2014 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this court record is
19 attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

20 15. Genea's Notice of Motion and Motion to Strike portions of the State
21 Complaint, filed October 17, 2014 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this
22 court record is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

23 16. Judge Mary Fingal Schulte's Civil Minute Order requiring Plaintiffs to
24 file their amended complaint by November 19, 2014, entered October 29, 2014 in the
25 State Action. A true and correct copy of this court record is attached hereto as Exhibit
26 4.

27 17. Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint for Damages, filed December 1,
28 2014 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this court record is attached

1 hereto as Exhibit 5.

2 18. Genea's Notice of Demurrer and Statement of Demurrer to the First
3 Amended Complaint, filed January 20, 2015 in the State Action. A true and correct
4 copy of this court record is attached hereto as Exhibit 6.

5 19. Genea's Notice of Motion and Motion to Strike the First Amended
6 Complaint, filed January 20, 2015 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this
7 court record is attached hereto as Exhibit 7.

8 20. Plaintiffs' Counter Motion to file (Proposed) Second Amended
9 Complaint for Damages. A true and correct copy of this court record is attached
10 hereto as Exhibit 8.

11 21. Judge Mary Fingal Schulte's March 30, 2015 Tentative Ruling, published
12 April 1, 2015 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this court record is
13 attached hereto as Exhibit 9.

14 22. Judge Mary Fingal Schulte's Civil Minute Order granting Defendant's
15 demurrer, entered April 1, 2015 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this
16 court record is attached hereto as Exhibit 10.

17 23. Judge Mary Fingal Schulte's Civil Minute Order dismissing the State
18 Action without prejudice for failure to amend as required by the Court, entered June 3,
19 2015 in the State Action. A true and correct copy of this court record is attached
20 hereto as Exhibit 11.

21 **I. ARGUMENT**

22 A. *Legal Standard*

23 The standard for judicial notice set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 201
24 allows a court to take judicial of an adjudicative fact not subject to "reasonable
25 dispute," either because it is "generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the
26 trial court" or it is "capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources
27 whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b). A court
28 may take judicial notice if requested by a party and "supplied with necessary

information.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(c)(2). Further, a court may take judicial notice of any court records of this state or the United States. *See Fazio v. Reoconstruct Co.*, N.A., No. C13-554-MEJ, 2013 WL 1962336, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2013) (court granting request for judicial notice of court records); *see also Lee v. Bender*, No. C04-2637-SBA, 2005 WL 1388968, at *8 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2005) (court granting judicial notice of court records and further stating that “[c]ourt filings and orders are the type of documents that are properly noticed under Federal Rule of Evidence 201”).

B. Defendant Genea's Court Records from the Prior Federal Action and Prior State Action

Genea requests this Court take judicial notice of the items listed in paragraphs 1-23 above. Judicial notice of these documents is appropriate because they are court records and were filed in concurrent litigation, which Courts have found suitable for judicial notice. *See Farahani v. Floria*, No. 12-CV_04637-LHK, 2013 WL 1703384, at n. 1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 19, 2013); *Holder v. Holder*, 305 F.3d 854, 866 (9th Cir. 2002) (taking judicial notice of briefs filed in an earlier state court proceeding).

Accordingly, this Court may take judicial notice of the court filings and civil minute orders issued in the prior federal court action, Case No. SA CV 12-1406-DOC (MLGx) as well as in the court filings entered in the prior state court action, Case No. 30-2014-00735850.

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Genea respectfully requests that the Court grant its request for judicial notice of the above-listed documents.

Dated: December 11, 2015

DUANE MORRIS LLP

By: /s/ *Ray L. Wong*

Ray L. Wong
Patrick S. Salceda
Attorneys for Defendant
GENEA ENERGY PARTNERS,
INC